

## Exploring the Position of Curriculum Studies across the Continuum of Teacher Education in Ireland

Raymond Lynch\*, Orla McCormack and Jennifer Hennessy

*School of Education, University of Limerick, Limerick, Ireland*

\*Dr. Raymond Lynch,  
Lecturer,  
School of Education,  
University of Limerick,  
Castletroy,  
Limerick,  
Ireland.  
Tel: +353 (0)61 202359  
Email: [Raymond.Lynch@ul.ie](mailto:Raymond.Lynch@ul.ie)

### Abstract

Curriculum, while often narrowly defined, is a contested space that stimulates continuing international debate, yet the importance of curriculum studies is frequently overlooked across the continuum of teacher education. Within the Irish context a technicist interpretation of curriculum studies, focusing primarily of subject knowledge and development, has historically been adopted. More recent Teaching Council of Ireland policy documents have espoused a broader macro understanding of curriculum studies as a foundation discipline within initial teacher education. However, concerns have been raised regarding student teachers' ability to fully engage with such material so early in their professional development. With the recently embraced continuum of teacher education in Ireland, this paper examines how curriculum studies is currently defined by Irish policy and problematises how it is addressed in practice. The paper proceeds to explore emerging opportunities to expand this area of study across the continuum. A case for the place of curriculum studies as central to the advancement of the profession through the promotion of teachers as change agents is presented.

**Key Words:** curriculum studies, continuum of teacher education, change agent.

## Introduction

The development of students' curricular knowledge within initial teacher education (ITE) programmes is often promoted across many jurisdictions through the criteria and standards set by accrediting bodies. For example, the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership (AITSL 2015, 19) require that graduate teachers "have an understanding of their subject/s, curriculum content and teaching strategies". Similarly, the Education Council of Aotearoa New Zealand (NZTC 2010, 27) have set standards that require graduate teachers to "know how to select curriculum content appropriate to the learners and the learning context". In many instances such standards promote a passive understanding of the curriculum content and how to best engage with it (Goodson 2013). With the marked exception of the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS), understanding of the process of curriculum design, implementation and reform is less frequently prioritised by national accrediting bodies. The General Teaching Council for Scotland is one of the world's first independent self-regulating bodies for teaching, established under the 1965 Teaching Council (Scotland) Act, and has consistently promoted curriculum studies within ITE programmes in Scotland. As part of the mandatory requirements for registration with the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS 2012, 7), pre-service teachers must demonstrate "knowledge and understanding of the nature of the curriculum and its development". One of the core professional interests listed in the standards for ITE in Scotland is the requirement for teachers to engage "with current educational issues and contributing to the processes of curriculum research and development" (GTCS 2006, 3). The more recently established Teaching Council of Ireland also promotes curriculum studies as a core component of all ITE programmes. As part of its *Criteria and Guidelines for Programme Providers* the Council advocate that ITE programmes should "develop students' understanding of, and capacity to critically engage with curriculum aims, design, policy, reform, pedagogy and assessment" (Teaching Council 2011a, 13). These

criteria also require that graduates demonstrate knowledge and understanding of “the dynamic processes by which curriculum is designed and implemented” and how school culture impacts “the implementation of curriculum policy” (Teaching Council 2011a, 25-26). This emphasis represents a significant philosophical shift in Ireland from “a technicist mentality where curriculum is seen as document” (Gleeson and Ó Donnabháin 2009, 36) and was often adopted at the expense of wider macro-curricular debate. Acknowledging and extending beyond this conceptual frame, the authors propose an inclusive interpretation of curriculum studies that also acknowledges the macro curriculum issues and broad contextual factors identified by Gleeson (2000). Demonstrating the fragmentation of curriculum theory previously highlighted by Carr and Kemmis (2003), curriculum has historically been narrowly defined in Irish policy, focusing primarily on subject content. This is evident, for example, in the Education Act of 1998 where curriculum is addressed as ‘the subjects to be offered’, ‘the syllabus of each subject’, ‘the amount of instruction time to be allotted to each subject’, and ‘the guidance and counselling provision to be offered’ (Government of Ireland 1998, 29). However, there have been attempts to embrace a broader understanding of curriculum as presented in the 1995 White Paper on Education which stresses that “curriculum in schools is concerned, not only with the subjects taught, but also with how and why they are taught and with the outcomes of this activity for the learner” (Department of Education 1995, 19). This description accepts a more complex interpretation of curriculum which acknowledges the place of curriculum content, pedagogy and assessment. Expanding on this interpretation, the authors view curriculum studies as the critical exploration of included and excluded content, pedagogy, and assessment, as well as the implicit and explicit beliefs and values that underpin these components.

Challenges associated with curriculum studies have endured for several decades now, with Schwab (1969, 1) stating that “The field of curriculum is moribund, unable by its present

methods and principles to continue its work”. This was particularly applicable to the Irish context where Leonard and Gleeson (1999, 51) argued that the long-standing neglect of curriculum studies had resulted in a “serious lack of attention to both theoretical and practical aspects of the curriculum”. More recent policy documents express, in principle, a commitment to promoting the study of curriculum related issues within teacher education in Ireland. However, despite the recent advancement of curriculum studies as one of the defined foundation studies in the Teaching Council (2011a) ITE guidelines, there remains a significant lack of debate regarding the ability of newly qualified graduates to meet these objectives. Given students’ limited clinical experience within an already crowded initial teacher education curriculum, the potential to ensure authentic engagement with and understanding of macro curriculum issues is challenged. Coupled with enhanced awareness of the challenge of rallying against the ‘clamour for technical competence and subject knowledge’ (Hargreaves and Goodson 1996, 20) in the provision of engaged curriculum study experiences, recent developments regarding the continuum of teacher education (Teaching Council 2016) call into question the tendency to confine issues relating to curriculum studies to an ITE context in Ireland. The following article aims to problematise this challenge and explore the positioning of curriculum studies across the continuum of teacher education. Contextual considerations are established by exploring recent changes to the continuum of teacher education in Ireland, as well as the place of curriculum studies within teacher education both internationally and nationally. Challenges and opportunities regarding the development of curriculum studies across the continuum of teacher education in Ireland are examined.

## **The Continuum of Teacher Education in Ireland**

There exists a widely held view that “a continuum, or bridge, is necessary in the professional development of teachers, linking initial training, entry into full time teaching, and subsequent longer-term learning” (Tickle 2000, 1). In Ireland, the Teaching Council Act (2001) endeavoured to promote continuing professional development (CPD) for both primary and post-primary teachers through the establishment of a national Teaching Council charged with promoting “the continuing education and training and professional development of teachers” (Government of Ireland 2001, section 6 (c), 8). Since its establishment in March 2006, the Teaching Council of Ireland has embraced the construct of teacher education as a ‘continuum’ (Conway *et al.* 2009), conceptualising all teachers as lifelong learners who engage in professional development activities through initial teacher education, induction and early and continuing professional development. Following a lengthy consultation period, the Teaching Council published their *Policy on the Continuum of Teacher Education* in 2011. The publication of this policy was deemed a ‘significant development’ in the reconceptualization of teacher education across the continuum (Teaching Council 2011b). The promotion of the continuum in Ireland however is contested as teacher education in this context has traditionally focused heavily on initial teacher education and a “one-shot workshop model of CPD”, at the expense of broader conceptions of the continuum (Conway *et al.* 2009, xxviii). As a result, teacher education in Ireland remains characterised by fragmentation with insufficient linkages being made across the continuum (Teaching Council 2011b).

### *Initial Teacher Education,*

An historical overreliance on initial teacher education in Ireland, coupled with a lack of teacher educator involvement in teachers’ in-career education, has significantly hampered attempts to cohere educational provision across the continuum (Gleeson 2009; Teaching

Council 2011b). It has been argued that the lack of involvement of initial teacher educators in formal CPD initiatives for teachers in Ireland has served to militate against bridging the enduring theory-practice divide (Harford, MacRuairc and McCartan 2010; Hennessy and McNamara 2013). In addition, a technical bias has permeated not only strategy statements but also programme developments and appraisals resulting in a technicist interpretation of the curriculum and outdated models of provision in many instances (Gleeson 2009; Teaching Council 2011b). Cited as a backwash effect of the “chronic lack of investment in teachers’ [professional] development over the years” (2009, 353) this outlook has been noted as an explanation for the overriding emphasis on “technical adjustment” to new curriculum and programme developments in Ireland. Within this technicist approach, broader conceptualisations of professional learning have been subject to relegation in favour of more pragmatic responses to policy shifts.

### *Induction*

Owing to the ‘deficit model of thinking’ it reflects, Tickle (2000) argues against the identification of entrants onto the induction phase of their career as ‘beginning teachers’ or ‘newly qualified teachers’. This image, he argues, fails to recognise ‘transformative and dynamic dispositions’ of these teachers (Tickle 2000, 2). Rather, Tickle (2000, 2) asserts, induction should be viewed as a “process in which the capital already vested in new entrants by the time they become teachers can be extended by way of systematic and sensitive provision for their further professional development”, therein recognising the bridge between ITE and the in-career development of teachers as part of the continuum. Within Ireland, despite longstanding emphasis on the importance of bridging pre-service education and in-career development, a formalised system of induction to build on the experience of initial

teacher education and “lay the foundation for subsequent professional and personal growth and development” (Politis 2012, 11) was not established until the development of the National Pilot Programme on Teacher Induction (NPPTI) in 2002. Given the voluntary nature of this programme from its inception, induction has been described as the “weakest” element of the continuum (Coolahan 2007, 21) and the extent to which the practice reflects policy literature on this stage requires attention (Conway et al 2009, xxiii). Howey and Zimpher (1999, 297) contend that “nowhere is the absence of a seamless continuum in teacher education more evident than in the early years of teaching”. Perhaps unsurprisingly then, in the absence of a statutory framework for induction, there exists strong evidence of the informal induction of beginning teachers in Ireland into “the prevailing dominant culture of teaching and learning practices” (Conway et al 2009, xxi), a practice which runs counter to the frequently cited rhetoric of established professional learning structures. In an attempt to address this, the Teaching Council of Ireland introduced the *Droichead Pilot Programme* in 2013 “to provide whole-school support for the induction of newly qualified teachers (NQTs) within primary and post-primary schools” (Smyth *et al.* 2016, 195). A recent review of this pilot induction programme highlighted the need to ensure complementarity and continuity of learning for teacher across the continuum (Smyth *et al.* 2016).

### *Early and Continuing Professional Development*

While it is clear that there has been an enhanced focus on promoting the continuum of teacher education in recent years, Ireland does not have a strong history of fostering meaningful engagement in continuous professional development (Clarke and Killeavy 2012). The provision of CPD in Ireland has been historically fragmented, underfunded and poorly implemented (Lynch, Hennessy and Gleeson 2013). With a traditionally narrowed definition and a lack of theoretical basis in Ireland (Harford 2010, 355), CPD has been, ‘over a 40-year

period ... the subject of extended debate' (Clarke and Killeavy 2012, 131). Frequently criticised for its 'top down' over-emphasis on nationally driven activities and an under-emphasis on activities meeting school needs (Halbert and MacPhail 2010, 28), participation levels in this stage of the continuum across Ireland has remained low. The 2009 TALIS report, for example, cited Irish teachers' participation rates at just 5.6 days over an 18 month period, the lowest participation rate across the 23 countries surveyed as part of the report (OECD 2009). In a context where a tradition of failed reform agendas has emerged, it may be perceived that 'system goals' have taken priority over personal professional needs in the provision of CPD (Sugrue 2004, 80). To date, where CPD has addressed curriculum change and reform in Ireland it has tended to focus "largely on equipping teachers to respond to curricular change" (Harford 2010, 357) rather than on promoting teachers as active change agents. Given the important role of CPD in promoting and supporting teacher change agency (Darling-Hammond, Bullmaster and Cobb 1995; Muijs and Lindsay 2008), enhanced focus on the reconceptualisation of CPD provision is required. The extension of curriculum studies across the continuum may act as a first step in this endeavour and provide a response to calls for "curriculum and other professional domains to be addressed in a coherent and complementary manner" across the continuum of teacher education (Granvillle 2005, 57). This is recognised within the recently published Teaching Council (2016) policy and framework for teachers' continuing professional development entitled *Cosán* which builds on the Droichead pilot programme. This flexible framework was designed to provide "a long-awaited opportunity to affirm the value of teachers' learning and acknowledge the full range of learning activities that teachers undertake" (Teaching Council 2016). *Cosán* recognises "contributing to curriculum development" (Teaching Council 2016, 16) as an important CPD activity that teachers should participate in.



## **Initial Teacher Education and Curriculum Studies**

Curriculum is notoriously difficult to define (Gleeson 2009) and its definition remains contentious (Marsh 1997). Consequently, the inclusion of curriculum related issues within ITE, is often thwarted by a lack of clarity on the term ‘curriculum’. Johnston (1994, 526) proposes that “a single definition of curriculum is not easily provided and therefore there is no clear picture of what courses in curriculum should be about”. Frequently viewed as referring to ‘content’ only (AITSL 2015; Gleeson 2009; NZTC 2010), curriculum related issues are often positioned within subject specific modules therein limiting the focus placed on “generic curriculum concepts such as curriculum theory, curriculum development, school-based curriculum decision making, and school or curriculum change” (Johnston 1994, 525). For example, Crook (2002, 62) refers to “curriculum and methods”, while Collins (2004, 233) outlines that “curriculum (methods) studies... link subject matter knowledge to current school curriculum and appropriate pedagogy”. Such a narrowed definition fails to acknowledge wider, macro curricular issues such as curriculum selection and development, the philosophical underpinnings of curriculum, the contextual nature of curriculum, as well as issues related to school culture, curriculum reform, the impact of assessment on teachers practice and the personal dimensions of change (Fullan and Miles 1999). Crook (2002, 63) suggests that curriculum studies is frequently unsuccessful in its attempts to position itself as a foundation subject. The eclectic nature of curriculum studies, drawing as it does on philosophical, sociological and historical dimensions of schooling, may make such categorisation problematic (Skilbeck 1984). Perhaps reflective of the original focus and structure of ITE, emphasis is frequently placed on the traditional foundation subjects (Crook 2002; Gambhir *et al.* 2008; Stuart and Tatto 2000). As a result, according to Johnston (1994, 525) “curriculum studies occupy a more tenuous position in teacher education than

established disciplines such as sociology, philosophy and psychology”. While modules on curriculum form part of the majority of pre-service and in-service programmes, literature outlining the structure and nature of these modules is limited (Johnston 1994). Where the nature and focus of modules within initial teacher education are discussed, curriculum studies remains largely absent (see for example Collins 2004).

Within an Irish context, Gleeson (2004, 47) suggests that “the Foundation Disciplines form the ‘spine’ of the programme in most colleges” and laments the limited emphasis placed on curriculum studies within ITE in Ireland in comparison to other countries (ibid, 50). He argues that the “curriculum studies movement has largely passed us by” (Gleeson 2009, 373). This is further reflected in the claims of Farrell and Trant (1999) and Gleeson and Ó Donnabháin (2009) who argue that, due to the technicist nature of schooling in Ireland, there is limited interest in whole curriculum issues. However, recent publications by the Teaching Council of Ireland (Teaching Council 2011a; b; 2012) are beginning to position the teacher as playing an important role in curriculum development and emphasise the role and requirements of ITE in this regard. The Policy on the Continuum of Teacher Education (Teaching Council 2011b), while frequently equating curriculum to syllabus, subjects and content, reinforces the importance of curriculum studies within teacher education in Ireland. The Codes of Professional Conduct for Teachers (Teaching Council 2012), indicates that teachers’ professional role responsibilities involve “engaging with, and reflecting on.... curriculum development” (p.7) as well as “engag[ing] with the planning, implementation, and evaluation of curriculum at classroom and school level” (p.8). One potential avenue through which Irish teachers can engage in curriculum issues is by engaging with the National Council for Curriculum and Assessment (NCCA), the main body responsible for curriculum development in Ireland. Working from a representational partnership approach, the NCCA enables teachers, in theory, to participate in curriculum consultation, debate and

development. However, unless teachers subscribe heavily to their union, their participation and voice in the NCCA remains minimal, with partnership still being ‘concentrated at a top representative level’ (Gleeson 2009, 261). Engagement in wider consultative initiatives, conducted by the NCCA during the process of curriculum development, offers all teachers a further opportunity to contribute to the development of national curriculum. However, levels of teacher engagement in these consultative processes remains low (see for example NCCA 2011). Consequently, there exists little evidence of the voice of the wider educational community in the curriculum decision-making process in Ireland (Gleeson, 2009, p.277).

While recent Irish policy documents are beginning to signal the positioning of curriculum studies across the continuum, especially with respect to teacher CPD (Granville 2005), many influences serve to militate against the realisation of such policy ambitions. These influences include the prevailing high level of fragmentation across the Irish education system (Gleeson 2000) and the failure to recognise the significance of the ‘school factor’ (Gleeson *et al.* 2002), combined with a lack of engagement by the wider education community on curriculum development issues (NCCA 2011). However, perhaps of more direct concern with respect to the content of such policy documents, is the fact that the focus of responsibility continues to remain firmly within initial teacher education. This is problematic as many have argued that teachers’ level of professional experience can have a significant impact on their ability to critically engage in curriculum change and reform (Bryan and Abell 1999; Richardson 1990). This raises questions around students’ ability to fully engage in meaningful discussion on their role as change agents within initial teacher education and challenges the current pervasive practice in Ireland of positioning curriculum studies solely within ITE. Furthermore, there exists evidence to suggest that curriculum studies related issues may not reflect the primary active concerns of student teachers, thus reducing students’ motivation to study curriculum studies within initial teacher education programmes.

### *Curriculum Studies and the Focus of Teachers' Concerns*

Numerous studies have found that pre-service and in-service teachers pass through stages of concern during their teacher development and career (Conway and Clark 2003; Fuller 1969; Hong 2010). Fuller's model of concerns (Fuller 1969) suggests that teachers have different priorities depending on their stage of development, moving from a focus on self to a focus on task and impact on students. During early career development, priority tends to be on 'self' and 'survival', with minimum attention afforded to students or their learning (Fuller 1969; Katz 1972; Watzke 2007). Concerns of pre-service and newly qualified teachers frequently centre on maintaining discipline, control and subject knowledge (Fuller 1969). Gaining and maintaining control of the learning environment are perceived as 'food and drink' for pre-service teachers, without which they cannot begin to consider other aspects of teaching and learning (Fuller 1969, 222). Such focus on 'self-survival' tends to decrease with greater levels of teaching experience and success. Supporting the work of Fuller (1969), many additional studies have found that with increased teaching experience, teachers' concerns moved from self-concern to greater emphasis on tasks and the impact on students (Pigge and Marso 1997; Reeves and Kazelskis 1985; Watzke 2007).

During pre-service and early career teaching, Fuller (1969, 210) found limited teacher concern relating to many topics explored within initial teacher education programmes including issues link to curriculum studies. As a result, it has been argued that initial teacher education is "not speaking to teachers where they are" (Fuller and Bown 1975, 50). Katz (1972, 53) suggests that "the issues dealt with in the traditional social foundations courses do not seem to address themselves to the early survival problems that are critical to the inexperienced teacher". According to Fuller (1969, 208) "education courses may be

answering quite well questions students are not asking”. Resultant feelings of frustration and anger amongst teachers towards their programmes of initial teacher education may serve to reduce the perceived relevance of theory to teachers work (Fuller and Bown 1975). These research findings, which are more recently supported by the work of Hong (2010), suggest that pre-service teachers are not ready, based on their current stage of concerns, to benefit from the nature and focus of their initial teacher education programme. Curriculum studies may potentially be one such area that is beyond the pre-service teachers’ areas of concern.

While Fuller’s model of concerns has ‘endured’ (Conway and Clark 2003, 467), many have questioned its appropriateness and relevance to teacher development, be it in-service or pre-service. In particular, questions have been asked about the chronological framework provided by Fuller (1969) with, Reeves and Kazelskis (1985) suggesting that teachers cannot be expected to pass through the stages of concerns at the same rate or in the same order. While others have argued that the model is over simplistic (Day 1999; Hong 2010; Watzke 2007). Acknowledging the contested nature of Fuller’s model, an examination of the stages of concern presented within does raise questions regarding the potential relevance and benefits of addressing curriculum studies solely within an ITE context. However, this is not to suggest that curriculum studies should be completely removed from ITE either. It has been highlighted that continued emphasis on addressing pre-service teachers’ immediate concerns could result in “complex and important questions or problems of practice get[ting] postponed in deference to resolving the technical and survival concerns of teacher candidates” (Conway and Clark 2003, 467). This could result, for example, in macro curriculum issues not being explored within initial teacher education due to the view that pre-service teachers aren’t ‘ready’ for such issues. Adler (1991), while stressing the importance of supporting pre-service teachers to ‘survive’ within the school context, believes that teacher development should stimulate teachers to view and consider their world from alternative perspectives.

Teachers are viewed as being more malleable during their initial teacher education and are less open to new perspectives once established within a school (Decker and Rimm-Kaufman 2008). An opportunity could be lost if the exploration of certain educational issues are delayed until it is perceived that pre-service teachers are ‘ready’ to engage with them. Therefore, there currently exists a need to strike a better balance between introducing students to curriculum studies related issues within ITE and acknowledging the emerging continuum of teacher education in Ireland. Failure to achieve this balance could significantly inhibit teachers’ professional development in Ireland.

### **Curriculum Studies, Teacher Professionalism and Agency**

A narrow interpretation and positioning of curriculum studies across the continuum of teacher education (Teaching Council 2011b) holds the potential to significantly weaken the professional status of teachers. When situated within the, albeit somewhat unsophisticated, ‘classical’ framing of professionalism, the role of teachers as curriculum developers is intrinsically linked to the professional status of the teaching profession (Hargreaves and Goodson 1996). This is reflected in the comments of Trant (1998, 28) who argues that “teachers cannot claim the status of professionalism until they assume their full responsibility towards all aspects of the curriculum”. As highlighted by Carlgren (1999, 54), in order for teachers to develop professionalism “they need experience of the practice of reflective curriculum planning”. The promotion of teachers as curriculum developers rather than singularly as implementers supports the development of teachers’ professional autonomy and the maintenance of professional standards. Teachers who “engage in curriculum development activities acquire” key “professional skills” (Shawer 2010, 175) including the ability to develop professional collaborations that advance student centred learning

experiences. Teacher engagement in curriculum development can therefore be seen as fundamental to *inter alia*; the profession assuming collective responsibility for the development and maintenance of professional standards, the continued enhancement of a professional knowledge base, and the progression of student centred learning. However, this does not assuage the challenges associated with curriculum change and reform. To fully engage with meaningful curriculum development, requires appreciation of complex curriculum issues including, *inter alia*, content, pedagogy, assessment and the beliefs and values that underpin these components.

Implementing changes to curriculum and to teachers' practices is a highly personal and emotive process (Goodson 2001). During this process, regardless of the potential outcome, feelings of discomfort, loss and bereavement are often experienced by teachers (Handal and Herrington 2003; Hargreaves 1998). A natural response to change and transition is an attitude of suspicion, defensiveness, and insecurity (Fullan, Miles and Taylor 1980), especially with respect to curriculum development in schools where there is a long history of ill-conceived and politically motivated top-down reforms, (Bray 1999; Gitlin and Margonis 1995). It is also unlikely that those who engage in the change process will change their practices unless their beliefs and values are considered (Handal and Herrington 2003). Goodson (2001) stresses that the personal dimension of change must be acknowledged, for "when teachers detach their identity projects, their 'hearts and minds' from school, change is unlikely to be successful' (ibid, 55). For beliefs and values to be modified, those responsible for bringing about change need to be involved and have a voice in the development and implementation of new initiatives (MacDonald 2003). Consequently, many authors such as Darling-Hammond (2006), Gitlin and Margonis (1995) and Fullan (1993) have called for the active engagement of teachers as change agents in the co-construction of curriculum.

While all aspects of teacher education play a role in this regard, Fullan (1993, 14) places significant emphasis on the role of initial teacher education in promoting change agency amongst teachers. For ITE to play its part in this ‘solution’ (ibid), it requires a change in the way in which pre-service teachers are taught, including, amongst other things, the promotion of greater clinical practice (Darling-Hammond 2006). Change in schools requires programmes of ITE to support pre-service teachers in developing a repertoire for reform minded teaching, to understand the change process and to begin to form habits and skills, such as collaboration, that will support their role as change agents in their own classroom, schools and education systems<sup>1</sup> (See for example Feiman-Nemser 2001). If teachers are to have a ‘voice’ in curriculum development, they first require the language to engage in curriculum discussion and debate with both their colleagues and policy makers. The positioning of curriculum studies across the continuum with continued scaffolded exposure to such forms of teacher development throughout a teacher’s career, could act as one vehicle for promoting such debate (Feiman-Nemser 2001). In this regard, curriculum studies is central to the advancement of teacher agency and the promotion of teachers’ professional autonomy (Trant 1998).

### **Conceptualising curriculum studies across the continuum of teacher education**

The recently embraced continuum of teacher education in Ireland presents opportunities to reimagine how curriculum studies is addressed and to challenge the normalisation of ITE as the sole site of teacher training and learning in this area. There are now prospects to advance

---

<sup>1</sup> The authors are not advocating the development of ‘passive’ teachers who merely implement the reform agenda of external bodies. Rather, they argue for the development of critical thinkers who are capable, as Trant (1998) suggests, of becoming prophets of the education system.



curriculum studies beyond initial teacher education and into teachers' induction and in-career stages of development.

### ***Initial Teacher Education***

While acknowledging concerns surrounding the potential efficacy of curriculum studies within programmes of ITE for pre-service teachers, a renewed emphasis on the place of this learning within the frame of the continuum of education is required. Affording space for the study of curriculum development issues within Initial Teacher Education, holds the potential to offset the development or crystallisation of more 'restricted' views of what the teaching profession entails (Adler 1991). Such a task is well placed within the parameters of ITE in order to support teacher identity development prior to the transition to the less 'malleable' world of schools (Decker and Rimm-Kaufman 2008). ITE has an important role to play in supporting pre-service teachers in developing "a basic repertoire for reform-minded teaching" (Feiman-Nemser 2001, 1026) through the deconstruction of existing beliefs, or lay-theories (Sugrue 1997) concerning teachers' role in curriculum issues. The challenge of resisting restricted views of teaching within ITE is inexorably interwoven with the opportunity of drafting 'new visions' of what it means to be a teacher (Feiman-Nemser 2001, 1016). A concomitant rejection of the de-intellectualisation of teaching, challenges any passive engagement with the curriculum on the part of the teacher. Moving beyond the traditional replication, application or interpretation of curriculum (Eraut 1994), ITE provides space for pre-service teachers to explore opportunities for curriculum construction prior to entering the next phase of the continuum. Challenging the unhelpful construct of 'teacher-proof curricula' with its associated submissive and technicised teacher response to the curriculum, a new vision for curriculum studies within the continuum encourages the role of teacher as

curriculum co-constructor, placing them in an active role at the heart of the curriculum decision making process. Recognition of the macro curricular dimensions of educational provision may, in no small part, assist pre-service teachers in questioning their previously held assumptions regarding curriculum (Carr and Kemmis 2003) and encourage the adoption of a change agency within the education system (Trant 1998). This pre-service experience should “lay a foundation” (Feiman-Nemser 2001, 1026) that can be further developed throughout a teachers’ career. Unchallenged at an early career stage, the potential for teacher agency within curriculum development and reform process may suffer (Conway and Clark 2003) and serve to militate against the future advancement of the teacher profession in Ireland.

### *Clinical Placement and Curriculum Studies*

It is to be acknowledged that “no matter how good a pre-service program may be, there are some things that can only be learned on the job” (Feiman-Nemser 2001, 1026). Therefore, clinical placement is viewed as a vital site of learning for pre-service teachers, with some arguing that “clinical experience should be the central focus of pre-service teacher education” (Zeichner 2010, 91). While often viewed as an instrumental site for improving one’s practice, such placements can also play a role in further developing pre-service teachers’ views and skills on curriculum concepts introduced as part of their initial teacher education programme. However, others have challenged this perspective, with Darling-Hammond (2006, 308) warning against a teacher education curriculum that is dominated by clinical experiences. Unscaffolded exposure to clinical placement can result in pre-service teachers conforming to the dominant culture of the school (Day 1999) as well as potentially advancing a theory practice divide (Grossman, Hammerness and McDonald 2009). Placement can result in a

‘wash-out’ effect (Zeichner and Tabachnick 1981), wherein pre-service teachers disregard the theory and values of their teacher education programme in light of conforming to the values and practices of their placement school. What is clear is that across multiple jurisdictions teacher educators are endeavouring to establish greater links between the theory covered as part of coursework, such as curriculum studies, and the clinical experiences of students in an attempt to support the development of teachers as change agents (Darling-Hammond 2012). In order to achieve this, greater alignment and collaboration is required between pre-service teachers, teacher education providers and practising teachers in placement sites (Gleeson, 2009).

Ensuring that pre-service teachers are provided with opportunities to work collaboratively with carefully selected and qualified co-operating teachers while on clinical placement is seen as important for the advancement of both teachers’ practice and the advancement of student teachers (Mooney Simmie and Moles 2011). Teachers need to learn to give each other feedback on their practice, a process that should begin at pre-service level (Postholm 2012). Cochran-Smith (1991, 285) argues that “despite their inexperience, student teachers do learn about teaching against the grain when they talk with experienced teachers within a collaborative context where questions are urged, answers are not expected, and the tentative forays of beginners are supported”. Many such professional and collaborative interactions as proposed here could be structured around curriculum issues relating to classroom practices. This could include, inter alia, exploring curriculum from the perspective of content, pedagogy and assessment (Teaching Council 2011a), by exploring one’s own values, beliefs and pedagogical approaches and the impact of assessment on teaching and learning. It is therefore essential that initial teacher education programmes and their associated placements provide pre-service teachers with the skills and dialect to meaningfully engage in professional conversations and collaboration around curriculum issues. When situated within the

promotion of 'teaching as a continuum' powerful curriculum engagement experiences initiated within ITE can be advanced, refined and sustained across the subsequent career phases.

### ***Induction***

Acknowledging the strong socialisation effect schools have on newly qualified teachers (Day 1999; Gleeson *et al.* 2015), induction and CPD also play an influential role in teachers' views of, and continued engagement with, curriculum issues throughout their career. Gleeson *et al.* (2015, 453) found that pre-service teachers are heavily influenced by the socialisation effect of school placement, with the "prevailing culture of teachers and schools" having a conservative influence on their beliefs and values regarding curriculum change and reform. Accordingly, they highlight the importance of establishing "meaningful partnerships between providers, schools and teachers to ensure the continuing professional development of mentor teachers" (Gleeson *et al.* 2015, 454). The importance of providing structured collaborative support for newly qualified teachers in Ireland through the support of trained and experienced teachers is also promoted in the recently developed teacher induction programme (Smyth *et al.* 2016). While many teachers experience pressure to conform (Langhout and Mitchell 2008), this is particularly pertinent for newly qualified teachers (NQT's). Rippon and Martin (2003, 216) found that NQT's experience a need to "feel part of the team from day one" with many viewing the first year of teaching as being "about conforming to the school ethos" (*ibid*, 218). Gleeson (2009, 16) also highlights the need to conform as particularly pertinent to Irish teachers, with many affected by "intellectual anaemia where 'to be' is to be 'like the rest'". This could have a negative impact on the engagement of NQT's in curriculum issues and can reduce the extent to which they bring about change in their practice, school or

district. In the endeavour to resist potentially malign conformity patterns, the support of ‘reform-minded’ mentors for NQTs is critical during the induction phase of teacher education. Hargreaves and Fullan (2000, 54) believe that:

Mentoring is a way of preparing teachers to become effective change agents who are committed to making a difference in the lives of young people and are skilled at the pedagogical and partnership developments that make success with students possible.

The focus of these collaborative relationships could begin to move beyond exploring individual teacher practices and encompass reflections on school communities as sites of curriculum change. NQTs could be encouraged to explore and critique the culture of their school (Dalin 1993) and to examine how their schools responds to curriculum reform initiatives. In order for this to be effective a ‘reflective practitioner model’ is required, wherein the mentor acts as a critical friend and co-inquirer (Mooney Simmie and Moles 2011) to reflect on practice and bring about change. This holds the potential to further enhance the collaborative skills that NQT’s are encouraged to develop during the clinical placement dimension of their initial teacher education.

Collaboration by both the co-operating and mentor teacher in the form of an adopted co-inquiry approach holds the potential to be “mutually reinforcing” (Smyth 1989, 7) with both the ‘novice’ and ‘veteran’ teacher gaining from the process. Engagement in reflective collaborative relationships can result in “both pre-service and in-service teachers.... support[ing] one another in the effort to reclaim the classroom” (Smyth 1989, 7). With this in mind, following engagement in the induction process, the once NQT could begin to move towards the role of mentor providing continuity across the continuum. Being a mentor can be “a powerful professional development experience for veteran teachers” and in turn mentor teachers can “become a resource for schools and districts as well as for teacher education programmes” (Feiman-Nemser 2001, 1027). The focus of such collaborative reflections

would then move beyond the classroom and school to encompass the district and wider education system, with experienced teachers being encouraged and supported to engage with other schools in their district, as well as with policy makers, in relation to curriculum decisions and selections. This is supported by a recently published review of the Droichead teacher induction pilot programme in Ireland which promoted “linking induction explicitly to wider curriculum and educational reforms” (Smyth *et al.* 2016, 16). Teachers’ involvement in such mentorship programmes and contributions to curriculum development initiatives should be recognised as part of their professional development and there are several models available to acknowledge this (See for example Lynch, Hennessy & Gleeson 2013). This also requires the continued advancement of teachers’ knowledge and skills relevant to curriculum studies throughout their professional career.

### ***Continuing Professional Development***

As highlighted by Harford (2010, 357), within the Irish context CPD has predominantly focused on supporting teachers to respond to curriculum change. CPD initiatives have failed to emphasise teachers as change agents and the development of associated curriculum studies skills required for the successful co-construction of curriculum. For the effective integration of curriculum studies across the continuum of teacher education clear links are required. Future CPD initiatives must build on the reflective spaces to study issues related to curriculum development provided for within initial teacher education and induction settings, as well as supporting the advancement of collaborative relationships developed through clinical placements and teacher mentoring programmes. The recently launched framework for teachers’ learning, Cosán, is designed to reflect the “continuation of a journey that all teachers begin in initial teacher education” (Teaching Council 2016, 2) and presents a timely

opportunity to advance curriculum studies within teacher CPD and across the continuum. Building on existing collaborations developed between initial teacher education providers and school placement sites, CPD initiatives hold the potential to support teachers in examining both the micro and macro curriculum development issues that impact their profession. At present, while Irish educational policy has embraced the principle of teacher CPD as part of the continuum of teacher education (Teaching Council 2016), this has yet to be fully realised beyond the provision of technical support for teachers responding to curriculum change. The advancement of curriculum studies across the continuum could help better define the ‘P’ in CPD, as well as significantly elevating teacher CPD in Ireland to the professional level espoused in policy documents. Such ambition requires that teachers be provided with space to reflect on their evolving professional role as change agents, as well as on their own developmental journey from initial teacher education, through induction, to in-career teacher. However, as highlighted by Fullan (1993, 13) for teachers to examine their role as change agents the profession must first “make explicit the goals and skills of change agency”. While Cosán details the learning processes that Irish teachers engage in, it fails to explicitly outline learning outcomes associated with teacher CPD including the skills of change agency. Therefore, there exists an opportunity to define the requisite skills of change agency that CPD initiatives should endeavour to support, acknowledging the continuum of teacher education and the associated concerns of teachers at different stages of their development. Once such skills have been defined for all phases of the continuum of teacher education, pedagogical linkages can be developed that build incrementally to support the promotion of teachers as true change agents.

## **Concluding Thoughts**

The curriculum reform process is complex, difficult and multifaceted (Davis 2003; Handal and Herrington 2003), resulting in the majority of attempts at curriculum reform failing to make it past the classroom door (Cuban 1988). While numerous studies have identified differing factors that need to be considered when reforming curriculum, the central role of the teacher in the successful implementation of curriculum reform is acknowledged (Goodson 2001). “Reforms that seek to by-pass teachers...will not succeed” (Kirk and MacDonald 2001, 552) and any attempt to “teacher-proof reforms” are likely to result in failure (MacDonald 2003, 140). State mandated legislation alone rarely results in deep change to teachers’ practices, beliefs and values (Fullan 2007). Teachers, therefore, are central to curriculum reform efforts (Davis 2003, 7) and curriculum studies plays a key role in developing the requisite skills for teachers to meaningfully engage in reform efforts and debates. Historically, curriculum studies was overlooked within teacher education in Ireland and when addressed, it was often solely positioned within initial teacher education programmes. Acknowledging the significant contextual challenges resulting from a tradition of fragmentation in Ireland, significant opportunities now exist with the recent development of a continuum of teacher education policy. Embracing these opportunities through the development of a model of curriculum studies for teachers that reflects the continuum of teacher education holds the potential to advance teacher professionalism and agency in Ireland.

## References

- Adler, S. 1991. The reflective practitioner and the curriculum of teacher education. *Journal of Education for teaching* 17, no. 2: 139-50.



- Aitsl. 2015. Accreditation of initial teacher education programs in australia: Standards and procedures. Melbourne: Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership.
- Bray, M. 1999. Control of education: Issues and tensions in centralization and decentralization. In *Comparative education: The dialectic of the global and the local*, eds Arnove, R, Torres, CA and Franz, S, 207-32. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Bryan, L.A. and S.K. Abell. 1999. Development of professional knowledge in learning to teach elementary science. *Journal of research in science teaching* 36, no. 2: 121-39.
- Carlgren, I. 1999. Professionalism and teachers as designers. *Journal of curriculum studies* 31, no. 1: 43-56.
- Carr, W. and S. Kemmis. 2003. *Becoming critical: Education, knowledge and action research* London: Routledge.
- Clarke, M. and M. Killeavy. 2012. Charting teacher education policy in the republic of ireland with particular reference to the impact of economic recession. *Educational Research* 54, no. 2: 125-36.
- Cochran-Smith, M. 1991. Learning to teach against the grain. *Harvard educational review* 61, no. 3: 279-311.
- Collins, C. 2004. Envisaging a new education studies major: What are the core educational knowledges to be addressed in pre-service teacher education? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education* 32, no. 3: 227-40.
- Conway, P.F. and C.M. Clark. 2003. The journey inward and outward: A re-examination of fuller's concerns-based model of teacher development. *Teaching and teacher education* 19, no. 5: 465-82.

- Conway, P.F., R. Murphy, A. Rath and K. Hall. 2009. Learning to teach and its implications for the continuum of teacher education: A nine-country cross-national study. Dublin: Teaching Council of Ireland.
- Coolahan, J. 2007. A review paper on thinking and policies relating to teacher education in Ireland. Maynooth: Teaching Council.
- Crook, D. 2002. Educational studies and teacher education. *British Journal of Educational Studies* 50, no. 1: 57-75.
- Cuban, L. 1988. *The managerial imperative and the practice of leadership in schools* New York: Suny Press.
- Dalin, P. 1993. *Changing the school culture* London: Cassell.
- Darling-Hammond, L. 2006. Constructing 21st-century teacher education. *Journal of teacher education* 57, no. 3: 300-14.
- Darling-Hammond, L. 2012. *Powerful teacher education: Lessons from exemplary programs* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Darling-Hammond, L., M.L. Bullmaster and V.L. Cobb. 1995. Rethinking teacher leadership through professional development schools. *The elementary school Journal*: 87-106.
- Davis, K.S. 2003. "Change is hard": What science teachers are telling us about reform and teacher learning of innovative practices. *Science Education* 87, no. 1: 3-30.
- Day, C. 1999. *Developing teachers: The challenges of lifelong learning* London: Falmer Press.
- Decker, L.E. and S.E. Rimm-Kaufman. 2008. Personality characteristics and teacher beliefs among pre-service teachers. *Teacher Education Quarterly* 35, no. 2: 45-64.
- Department of Education. 1995. *Charting our education future, white paper on education* Dublin: Department of Education and Science.
- Eraut, M. 1994. *Developing professional knowledge and competence* London: Falmer Press.

- Farrell, A. and A. Trant. 1999. Debating the future of the curriculum. Dublin: Curriculum Development Unit.
- Feiman-Nemser, S. 2001. From preparation to practice: Designing a continuum to strengthen and sustain teaching. *The Teachers College Record* 103, no. 6: 1013-55.
- Fullan, M. 1993. Why teachers must become change agents. *Educational leadership* 50, no. 6: 12-17.
- Fullan, M. 2007. *The new meaning of educational change* London: Routledge.
- Fullan, M. and M. Miles. 1999. Getting school reform right. In *Creating people-centred schools: School organisation and change in south africa.*, ed. Gulting, J, Ndhlovu, T. & Bertram, C. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
- Fullan, M., M.B. Miles and G. Taylor. 1980. Organization development in schools: The state of the art. *Review of educational research* 50, no. 1: 121-83.
- Fuller, F.F. 1969. Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American educational research journal*: 207-26.
- Fuller, F.F. and O.H. Bown. 1975. Becoming a teacher (74th yearbook of the national society for the study of education, pt. Ii, pp.25-52). In *Teacher education*, ed. Ryan, K. Chicago: university of Chicago Press.
- Gambhir, M., K. Broad, M. Evans and J. Gaskell. 2008. *Characterizing initial teacher education in canada: Themes and issues* Ontario: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto.
- Gitlin, A. and F. Margonis. 1995. The political aspect of reform: Teacher resistance as good sense. *American Journal of Education* 103, no. 4: 377-405.
- Gleeson, J. 2000. Sectoral interest versus the common good? Legitimation, fragmentation and contestation in irish post-primary curriculum policy and practice. *Irish Educational Studies* 19, no. 1: 16-34.

- Gleeson, J. 2004. Concurrent teacher education (post-primary) in the republic of ireland: Some issues and trends. In *Teacher education in the republic of ireland: Retrospect and prospect*, ed. Burke, A, 43-52. Dublin: SCoTENS.
- Gleeson, J. 2009. *Curriculum in context: Partnership, power and praxis in ireland* Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Gleeson, J., A. Clifford, T. Collison, S. O'driscoll, M. Rooney and A. Tuohy. 2002. School culture and curriculum change: The case of the leaving certificate applied (lca). *Irish Educational Studies* 21, no. 3: 21-44.
- Gleeson, J. and D. Ó Donnabháin. 2009. Strategic planning and accountability in irish education. *Irish Educational Studies* 28, no. 1: 27-46.
- Gleeson, J., J. O'flaherty, T. Galvin and J. Hennessy. 2015. Student teachers, socialisation, school placement and schizophrenia: The case of curriculum change. *Teachers and Teaching* 21, no. 4: 437-58.
- Goodson, I.F. 2001. Social histories of educational change. *Journal of Educational Change* 2, no. 1: 45-63.
- Goodson, I.F. 2013. *School subjects and curriculum change* London: The Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis Inc.
- Government of Ireland. 1998. *Education act* Dublin: Stationery Office.
- Government of Ireland. 2001. *Teaching council act*. Dublin: Stationery Office.
- Granvillle, G. 2005. Cultivating professional growth: An emergent approach to teacher development- evaluation report on the impact and experience of the second level support service. Dublin: Department of Education and Science.
- Grossman, P., K. Hammerness and M. McDonald. 2009. Redefining teaching, re-imagining teacher education. *Teachers and Teaching: theory and practice* 15, no. 2: 273-89.

- Gtcs. 2006. Standard for initial teacher education. Edinburgh: General Teaching Council for Scotland.
- Gtcs. 2012. The standards for registration: Mandatory requirements for registration with the general teaching council for scotland. Edinburgh: General Teaching Council for Scotland.
- Halbert, J. and A. Macphail. 2010. Curriculum dissemination and implementation in ireland: Principal and teacher insight. *Irish Educational Studies* 29, no. 1: 25-40.
- Handal, B. and A. Herrington. 2003. Mathematics teachers' beliefs and curriculum reform. *Mathematics education research journal* 15, no. 1: 59-69.
- Harford, J. 2010. Teacher education policy in ireland and the challenges of the twenty-first century. *European Journal of Teacher Education* 33, no. 4: 349-60.
- Harford, J., G. Macruairc and D. McCartan. 2010. 'Lights, camera, reflection': Using peer video to promote reflective dialogue among student teachers. *Teacher Development* 14, no. 1: 57-68.
- Hargreaves, A. 1998. The emotional practice of teaching. *Teaching and teacher education* 14, no. 8: 835-54.
- Hargreaves, A. and M. Fullan. 2000. Mentoring in the new millennium. *Theory into practice* 39, no. 1: 50-56.
- Hargreaves, A. and I. Goodson. 1996. Teachers' professional lives: Aspirations and actualities. In *Teachers' professional lives*, eds Goodson, I and Hargreaves, A, 1-28. London: Routledge Falmer.
- Hennessy, J. and P. Mcnamara. 2013. At the altar of educational efficiency: Performativity and the role of the teacher. *English Teaching Practice and Critique* 12, no. 1: 6-22.
- Hong, J.Y. 2010. Pre-service and beginning teachers' professional identity and its relation to dropping out of the profession. *Teaching and teacher education* 26, no. 8: 1530-43.

- Howey, K.R. and N.L. Zimpher. 1999. Pervasive problems and issues in teacher education. In *The education of teachers (ninety-eight yearbook of the national society for the study of education, part i)*, ed. Griffin, GA, 279-305. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Johnston, S. 1994. Resolving questions of 'why' and 'how' about the study of curriculum in teacher education programmes. *Journal of curriculum studies* 26, no. 5: 525-40.
- Katz, L.G. 1972. Developmental stages of preschool teachers. *The elementary school Journal* 73, no. 1: 50-54.
- Kirk, D. and D. Macdonald. 2001. Teacher voice and ownership of curriculum change. *Journal of curriculum studies* 33, no. 5: 551-67.
- Langhout, R.D. and C.A. Mitchell. 2008. Engaging contexts: Drawing the link between student and teacher experiences of the hidden curriculum. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 18, no. 6: 593-614.
- Leonard, D. and J. Gleeson. 1999. Context and coherence in initial teacher education in Ireland: The place of reflective inquiry. *Teacher Development* 3, no. 1: 49-65.
- Lynch, R., J. Hennessy and J. Gleeson. 2013. Acknowledging teacher professionalism in Ireland: The case for a chartered teacher initiative. *Irish Educational Studies* 32, no. 4: 493-510.
- Macdonald, D. 2003. Curriculum change and the post-modern world: Is the school curriculum-reform movement an anachronism? *Journal of curriculum studies* 35, no. 2: 139-49.
- Marsh, C. 1997. *Understanding curriculum: Planning, management and ideology* Bristol, PA: Falmer Press, Taylor & Francis, Inc.

- Mooney Simmie, G. and J. Moles. 2011. Critical thinking, caring and professional agency: An emerging framework for productive mentoring. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning* 19, no. 4: 465-82.
- Muijs, D. and G. Lindsay. 2008. Where are we at? An empirical study of levels and methods of evaluating continuing professional development. *British educational research journal* 34, no. 2: 195-211.
- Ncca. 2011. Junior cycle developments - innovation and identity: Summary of consultation findings. Dublin: National Council for Curriculum and Assessment.
- Nztc. 2010. Approval, review and monitoring processes and requirements for initial teacher education programmes. Wellington: New Zealand Teachers Council.
- Oecd. 2009. Creating effective teaching and learning environments: First results from talis. Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Pigge, F.L. and R.N. Marso. 1997. A seven year longitudinal multi-factor assessment of teaching concerns development through preparation and early years of teaching. *Teaching and teacher education* 13, no. 2: 225-35.
- Politis, Y. 2012. The national induction programme for teachers (nipt): Ateci commissioned report. Dublin: ATECI.
- Postholm, M.B. 2012. Teachers' professional development: A theoretical review. *Educational Research* 54, no. 4: 405-29.
- Reeves, C.K. and R. Kazelskis. 1985. Concerns of preservice and inservice teachers. *The Journal of Educational Research* 78, no. 5: 267-71.
- Richardson, V. 1990. Significant and worthwhile change in teaching practice. *Educational researcher* 19, no. 7: 10-18.
- Rippon, J. and M. Martin. 2003. Supporting induction: Relationships count. *Mentoring and Tutoring* 11, no. 2: 211-26.

- Schwab, J.J. 1969. The practical: A language for curriculum. *The School Review* 78, no. 1: 1-23.
- Shawer, S.F. 2010. Classroom-level curriculum development: Efl teachers as curriculum-developers, curriculum-makers and curriculum-transmitters. *Teaching and teacher education* 26, no. 2: 173-84.
- Skilbeck, M. 1984. *School based curriculum development* London: Harper & Row Ltd.
- Smyth, E., P. Conway, A. Leavy, M. Darmody, J. Banks and D. Watson. 2016. Review of the droichead teacher induction pilot programme. Dublin: The Economic and Social Research Institute.
- Smyth, J. 1989. Developing and sustaining critical reflection in teacher education. *Journal of teacher education* 40, no. 2: 2-9.
- Stuart, J.S. and M.T. Tatto. 2000. Designs for initial teacher preparation programs: An international view. *International Journal of Educational Research* 33, no. 5: 493-514.
- Sugrue, C. 1997. Student teachers' lay theories and teaching identities: Their implications for professional development. *European Journal of Teacher Education* 20, no. 3: 213-25.
- Sugrue, C. 2004. Rhetorics and realities of cpd across europe: From cacophony towards coherence. In *International handbook on the continuing professional development of teachers*, eds Day, C and Sachs, J, 67-93. Berkshire: Open Univeristy Press.
- Teaching Council. 2011a. Initial teacher education: Criteria and guidelines for programme providers. Maynooth: Teaching Council of Ireland.
- Teaching Council. 2011b. Policy on the continuum of teacher education. Maynooth: Teaching Council of Ireland.
- Teaching Council. 2012. Codes of professional conduct for teachers. Maynooth: Teaching Council of Ireland.



- Teaching Council. 2016. Cosán: Framework for teachers' learning. Maynooth: Teaching Council of Ireland.
- Tickle, L. 2000. *Teacher induction: The way ahead* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Trant, A. 1998. Giving the curriculum back to teachers. In *The future of the curriculum*, eds Trant, A, Donnabháin, DÓ, Lawton, D and O'connor, T, 23-37. Dublin: CDU.
- Watzke, J.L. 2007. Longitudinal research on beginning teacher development: Complexity as a challenge to concerns-based stage theory. *Teaching and teacher education* 23, no. 1: 106-22.
- Zeichner, K. 2010. Rethinking the connections between campus courses and field experiences in college-and university-based teacher education. *Journal of teacher education* 61, no. 1-2: 89-99.
- Zeichner, K. and R. Tabachnick. 1981. Are the effects of university teacher education "washed out" by school experience? *Journal of teacher education* 32, no. 3: 7-11.